



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,838	10/29/2003	Jin Ook Kim	054358-5019	2506
9629 7590 01/03/2007 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			EXAMINER PATEL, ASHOK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/694,838

Applicant(s)

KIM, JIN OOK

Examiner

Ashok Patel

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2879

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/11/2006 has been entered.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakakibara et al (USPN 6007928).

As to claims 1 and 2, Sakakibara et al disclose applicant's claimed organic EL device including: first and second electrodes (2, 4) over a substrate; and an organic emission layer (3) between the first and second electrodes, the emission layer having a blended structure of: a block copolymer and an organic polymer emission material (at least col. 2, lines 45; col. 4,

Art Unit: 2879

lines 5-15; col. 4, lines 19-24; col. 5, lines 22-30; col. 6, paragraph 13-39; Table 1; col. 7, lines 19-28).

As to claims 3 and 27, the block is formed of two monomers (Table 3). As to claim 3, an anionic polymerization process limitation renders the claim of a product-by-process nature. The process limitation recited therein is not given a patentable weight. Even though product-by-process claim is limited by process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process." MPEP 2113.

Accordingly, no patentable weight is given to process step recited in claim 3.

As to claims 4-13, applicant's claimed polystyrene and polybutadiene monomers do not exist in the final product since they are intermediate or initial products used to obtain the final product. Therefore, these two claimed monomers, and their characteristics as recited in claims 5-13 are not given patentable weight.

As to claim 9, applicant is claiming the organic emission layer having different structure depending upon a spreading

Art Unit: 2879

coefficient between monomers constituting the block copolymers and the organic emission material. However as mentioned earlier, the monomers are intermediate products. Since Sakakibara et al's device includes monomers, as recited in claim 9, the organic emission layer of Sakakibara et al's device would also include different structure.

As to claims 10 and 12, applicant is claiming the organic emission material distributed around the monomers in the blended structure when the spreading coefficient of the monomer to the organic emission material is greater than 0. Also applicant is claiming the monomers distributed around the organic emission material in the blended structure when the spreading coefficient of the organic emission material to the organic emission material is greater than 0. As mentioned earlier, the monomers are intermediate products. Further, since Sakakibara et al's device includes the monomers and the organic emission material as claimed by applicant, the organic emission material or the monomers in Sakakibara et al's device would also be distributed respectively around the monomers or the organic emission material in the blended structure.

4. The Examiner responds to applicant's arguments as follows.

Applicant argues that Sakakibara et al do not teach or suggest the claimed organic EL device since the blended structure in Sakakibara et al's organic EL device does not include blended structure including: a block copolymer and an organic polymer emission layer.

This is not found persuasive since Sakakibara et al do teach or suggest the blended structure including: the block copolymer and the organic polymer emission layer. At many occurrences in Sakakibara et al's prior art reference, the Examiner pointed out the blended structure including the block copolymer and the organic polymer emission layer. See for example claim 3, which explicitly cites the blended structure including the block copolymer and the organic polymer emission layer.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-2456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

Art Unit: 2879

see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Ashok Patel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879